IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.V.K.BALI
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.SIRI JAGAN

TUESDAY, THE 21ST NOVEMBER 2006 / 30TH KARTHIKA 1928

WA.No. 536 of 2006()

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT IN WPC.27844/2004 Dated 09/11/2005
.....

APPELLANTS/RESPONDENTS 1 TO 3 IN THE WP
---

1. THE ACCOUNTS OFFICER (TR-II) (COMP)
CALICUT TELECOM DISTRICT, CALICUT.

2. THE DISTRICT MANAGER, BHARATH SANCHAR
NIGAM, TELECOM, CALICUT.

3. UNION OF INDIA, REPRESENTED BY THE
SECRETARY, MINISTRY OF TELECOMMUNICATION, NEWDELHI

BY ADV. SRI.C.S.RAMANATHAN

RESPONDENTS/PETITIONER/4TH RESPONDENT IN WP
---

1. N.P.MOIDU, ADVOCATE, 5/102A,
PERINTHALMANNA, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.

2. TAHASILDAR, PERINTHALMANNA.

BY ADV. SRI.T.SETHUMADHAVAN
SRI.K.JAYESH MOHANKUMAR
SRI.PUSHPARAJAN KODOTH
R2 BY SR.GOVERNMENT PLEADER MR.M.R.SABU

THIS WRIT APPEAL HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 21/11/2006, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

V.K. BALI, C.J. & S.SIRI JAGAN, J.

W.A.No.536 of 2006

Dated, this the 21st day of November, 2006

JUDGMENT

V.K.Bali,C.J.(Oral)

Learned counsel for the appellants states that since the first respondent who was a practising lawyer has now expired, the appellants would not press this appeal, but the order under appeal may not be treated as a precedent. This writ appeal is dismissed as withdrawn by specifically observing that judgment under appeal shall not be treated as a precedent.

V.K. BALI,
CHIEF JUSTICE.

S.SIRI JAGAN,
JUDGE.

vns